UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,380	04/11/2006	Niall Morton Hamilton	2815-0249PUS2	9070
	7590 12/01/200 ART KOLASCH & BI	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747	CH MA 22040 0747	SHAMEEM, GOLAM M		
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1626	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/01/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/575,380	HAMILTON ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Golam M. M. Shameem	1626			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 Oct</u> This action is FINAL . 2b)☑ This Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-12 is/are withdrawn 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accention and policion to the composite that any objection to the composite that the compos	r from consideration. The election requirement. The epted or b) □ objected to by the E				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti		• •			
,=	anniner. Note the attached Office	ACTION OF TOTAL			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/11/2006.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte			

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

This application is a 371 of PCT/EP04/52582 10/20/2004 and the claim of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) to DENMARK 200301566 10/23/2003 is acknowledged.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-12 are currently pending in the application. Claim 13 was canceled.

Receipt is acknowledged of amendment / response filed on October 08, 2008 and that has been entered.

Claims 9-12 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.142 (b) as being drawn to a non-elected subject matter.

Information Disclosure Statement

Receipt is acknowledged of Information Disclosure Statement (IDS), filed on 04/11/2006, which has been entered in the file.

Response to Election/Restriction

In response to the restriction requirements, Applicants have elected Group I, which includes claims 1-8 drawn to a compound of formula (I), and the elected species as set forth disclosed in Example 5 (Response, page 12), with traverse is acknowledged. Applicant's arguments (to withdraw restriction among Groups 1-III) have been fully considered and found unpersuasive at this time because the Invention groups I-III differ materially in structure and in element from each other and therefore, are capable of supporting their own patents.

The invention Groups I-III each relate to a set of structurally diverse and dissimilar compounds [having different variable groups, which are attached directly and indirectly to the formula (I)], compositions comprising compounds, and their methods of use, which do not possess a substantial common core wherein a reference anticipating one would not necessarily render the other obvious. The core does not define a contribution over the art. The ring structure of formula (I) is further substituted by different variables such as R⁵ and R⁷ etc, which are broadly defined and when the compound of formula (I) is taken as a whole, a plethora of vastly different compounds are possible. Thus these features are not considered 'special technical features' under PCT rules 13.1 and 13.2. Hence, the unity of invention is considered to be lacking and restriction of the invention in accordance with the rules of unity of invention is considered to be proper.

In addition, 35 U.S.C. 372 (b)(2) clearly states that unity of invention may be reexamined under 35 U.S.C. 121. Restriction was based on PCT Rule 13.1, 13.2 and Annex B part 1(b) together with 37 CFR 1.475 and 1.499 for lacking unity of invention because of lacking a significant structural element qualifying as the special technical features.

PCT Rule 13.2 states that the international application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept (requirement of unity of invention).

PCT Rule 13.2 states that unity of invention referred to in Rule 13.1 shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features.

Annex B (2)(V) when dealing with alternatives, if it can be shown that at least one Markush alternative is not novel over the prior art, the question of unity of invention shall be reconsidered by the Examiner. Reconsideration does not necessarily imply that an objection of lack of unity shall be raised. If the Examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) of the other invention. Nevertheless, the Examiner may reconsider to rejoin method of use claims commensurate in scope with the product claims when the case would be found in condition for allowance [provided those method claims are free from 35 U.S.C. §112 first (including written description, reach-through claim language and/or scope-enablement issues) and second paragraphs]. For these reasons, Applicant's arguments are found unpersuasive and, since 35 U.S.C. 101 allows one patent per invention, the requirement for restriction (election of species) is still deemed proper.

Applicants preserve their right to file a divisional on the non-elected subject matter.

As set forth in the restriction requirement and an election of a single compound (or set of compounds), the scope of the invention which has been examined, inclusive of the elected species is as follows:

A compound having the formula (I) wherein:

R⁵ is as claimed except "halo, nitro, alkyl" and

When one of R^b and R^c (for R⁷) is hydrogen, the other of R^b and R^c can not be "halo, nitro, alkyl".

As a result of the election and the corresponding scope of the compound identified, claims 9-12 and the remaining subject matter of claims 1-8 are withdrawn from further

consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142 (b) as being drawn to non-elected inventions. The withdrawn subject matter of claims 9-12 is properly restricted as it differs materially in structure and in element from the elected subject matter supra so as to be patentably distinct there from.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections, set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teuber *et al* (US 5,554,632). Applicant claims compounds (1,5,7-Trisubstituted benzimidazole derivatives), compositions and methods of use thereof.

Determination of the scope and content of the prior art (MPEP §2141.01)

Teuber *et al* (US '632) also disclose the synthesis of several 1,5,7-Trisubstituted benzimidazole compounds similar to those of instantly claimed invention.

Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims (MPEP §2141.02)

The difference between the claimed compound and that of the reference herein lies in the selection of a single substitution in "R⁷" variable, such as, when one of R^b and R^c (for R⁷) is hydrogen, the other of R^b and R^c is "alkyl" of instantly claimed compound instead of a hydrogen atom for the same position in the prior art [US '632, column 30, Table 6, No, 12g].

Finding of prima facie obviousness--rational and motivation (MPEP §2142-2413)

Art Unit: 1626

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made since Teuber *et al* teach compounds which are generic to the instantly claimed compound. It is well established that the substitution of alkyl for hydrogen on a known compound is not a patentable modification absent unexpected or unobvious results. *In re Wood,* 199 U.S.P.Q. 137 (C.C.P.A. 1978) and *In re Lohr,* 137 U.S.P.Q. 548, 549 (C.C.P.A. 1963). Therefore, in the instant case, one skilled in the chemical art would be motivated to choose to replace a hydrogen atom with an alkyl group or *vice versa* in view of the known teaching of the art. Since the core compound of the formula is not novel and the novelty (if there is any) belongs to the selection of variable substitution, a great caution should be exercised to determine the patentability of the claimed invention. Therefore, in looking at the instant claimed compounds as a whole, the claimed compound would have been suggested to one skilled in the art unless unobvious or unexpected results can be shown.

Objections

Claims 1-8 are objected to for containing non-elected subject matter. The claims should be amended to exclude non-elected subject matter and within the scope of elected compound.

Telephone Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Golam Shameem, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-0706. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph McKane, can be reached at (571) 272-0699. The Unofficial fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-7921. The Official fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/575,380

Art Unit: 1626

When filing a FAX in Technology Center 1600, please indicate in the Header (upper right)

"Official" for papers that are to be entered into the file, and "Unofficial" for draft documents and other

communications with the PTO that are not for entry into the file of the application. This will expedite

processing of your papers.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C.

132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to

[joseph.mcKane@uspto.gov]. All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the

application file. PTO employees will not communicate with applicant via Internet e-mail where

sensitive data will be exchanged or where there exists a possibility that sensitive data could be identified

unless there is of record an express waiver of the confidentiality requirements under 35 U.S.C. 122 by

the applicant. See the Interim Internet Usage Policy published by the Patent and Trademark Office

Official Gazette on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to

the Group receptionist, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

/Golam M. M. Shameem/

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1626

Technology Center 1600

Page 7

Application/Control Number: 10/575,380

Page 8

Art Unit: 1626

Application/Control Number: 10/575,380

Page 9

Art Unit: 1626